



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/665,178	09/19/2000	David Gilbert	462-99-012	1901

128 7590 05/12/2006

HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC.  
101 COLUMBIA ROAD  
P O BOX 2245  
MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962-2245

EXAMINER
----------

NGUYEN, HUY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

DATE MAILED: 05/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/665,178

Applicant(s)

GILBERT, DAVID

Examiner

Huy D. Nguyen

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 17-23, 25-31, 33, 34, 37, 38, 40 and 41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 2-15, 17-23, 25-31, 33, 34, 37, 38, 40 and 41 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 2617

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The Art Unit location of your application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Art Unit 2617.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 2/22/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicants submitted that Coberfin et al. does not describe controlling RF emissions of a wireless phone to maintain the RF emissions below a predetermined level. The examiner directs the applicants to column 4, lines 42-50 where the preceding limitation is taught. Coberfin et al. teaches that the mobile telephone R can be controlled to not cause interference. In order to control the telephone R not to cause interference, the RF emissions of R has to be controlled such that it is below the interference level. The applicants also believe that Koga appears to have nothing to do with the problem addressed by claim 1. The examiner responds that Koga teaches a method to suppress the emission level of radio wave below the level causing abnormal vibration caused by the radio wave emitted from the emission antenna using RF detector 43 and variable attenuator 46. The applicants submitted that the Office action did not make out a prima facie case of obviousness. The examiner responds that first the suggestion/motivation is taught in Koga which is to suppress the emission level of radio wave below the level causing abnormal vibration caused by the radio wave emitted from the emission antenna. Second, there is a reasonable expectation of success since both references are in the same field of endeavor which is RF

communications and both concentrate on suppressing RF emission so that danger of interference with electronic systems on board an aircraft can be avoided. Third, the combined prior art reference teaches all the claimed limitations.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coberfin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,269,243) in view of Koga (Patent No. JP41106448A – Document Identifier: JP 11064484 A).

Regarding claim 1, Coberfin et al. teaches an on-board base station (e.g., transponder 4, figure 2), comprising: an interface device (e.g., antenna 3, figures 1 & 2) on board an aircraft that interfaces with a separate wireless phone of a user inside the aircraft and with a wireless bearer system (figure 1); a controller (e.g., means of authority 5, column 4, line 30) that controls RF emissions of the separate wireless phone, to maintain the RF emissions below a predetermined level (e.g., interference level, column 4, lines 17-36). Coberfin et al. does not clearly teach an RF detector that detects RF emissions of the separate wireless phone, a controller coupled to the RF detector to maintain the RF emissions below a predetermined level. The preceding limitations are taught in Koga (see the abstract). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Koga to the teaching of Coberfin

Art Unit: 2617

et al. in order to prevent abnormal vibration caused by the radio wave emitted from the emission antenna (see abstract).

*Allowable Subject Matter*

5. Claims 8, 12, 18, 26, 41 were allowed previously with the reason set forth in the previous office action (dated 3/08/2005).

Claim 13 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 16. Therefore, claim 13 is now allowable with the same reason set forth in the previous office action (dated 3/08/2005).

Claim 19 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 24. Therefore, claim 19 is now allowable with the same reason set forth in the previous office action (dated 3/08/2005).

Claims 27-31, 33-34 have been rewritten to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection. Thus, claims 27-31, 33-34 are now allowable with the same reason set forth in the previous office action.

Claim 37 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 39. Therefore, claim 37 is now allowable with the same reason set forth in the previous office action (dated 3/08/2005).

Claims 2-7, 9-11 depend on claim 8. Therefore, they are allowable.

Claims 14-15, and 17 depend on claim 13. Therefore, they are allowable.

Claims 20-23, 25 depend on claim 19. Therefore, they are allowable.

Claims 38 and 40 depend on claim 37. Therefore, they are allowable.

***Conclusion***

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huy D. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-7845. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

67

Huy Nguyen

  
JOSEPH FEILDZ  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER